



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

thorough reading and testing of my book. It is a somewhat cruel kindness, which is liable to be misunderstood in England, where it is unusual to print in reviews a list of errors and misprints unless they happen to be serious ones. Many of Professor Bacher's suggestions indicate mere difference of opinion as to the method of translation. I was not writing a "crib" or literal translation, but one that would be read by a public entirely ignorant of Jewish matters. Again, several of Professor Bacher's corrections depend for their validity on emendations of the original texts, on which an amateur like myself durst not venture, even if I had been capable of making them. Thus the passage from Moses of Tachau is relieved of the mysterious "ox of the priest," *וּבַפֶּר כֹהֵן*, which puzzled me and all my learned friends by the simple emendation (*i.e.*, simple after it has been proposed) *וּבַפֶּר כֹהֵן*. In other cases Professor Bacher has a better text before him than I had access to at the time of writing. Finally, in several instances, I was simply following others, *e.g.*, Dr. Neubauer, on pp. 279, 280, and the late Professor Graetz, p. 263, and could plead the schoolboy's excuse, "Please, sir, it wasn't me." As to the misprints, which I regret to say I could largely supplement, cheap books have to be cheaply printed, and cheap printing means bad "reading" and many misprints. However, on the whole, I have escaped as well as I could have expected from the minute scrutiny of such an expert as Professor Bacher. It is not everybody who is, like him, a specialist in almost all branches of Jewish literature. As a "generalist," I do not grudge him the revenge he takes upon me for venturing in where specialists have hitherto feared to tread. The fact that he is inclined to accept nearly all the revolutionary hypotheses I have suggested consoles me somewhat for his rejection of some of my versions. And he does his correction so gently, that he makes it almost, though not quite, a pleasure to be corrected by him. Still, on the whole, I feel inclined to say with the lover to his mistress in the play :

No doubt it was right to dissemble your love,
But why did you kick me downstairs ?

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Jesus and Modern Life. By M. J. SAVAGE (Boston, U.S.A., 1893).

AS co-editor of THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW I received an American book called *Jesus and Modern Life*, by M. J. Savage. That such a book should have been sent to such a periodical is not,

in the abstract, inappropriate. Any critical attempt to determine the true character and teaching of the most important Jew who ever lived—of one who exercised a greater influence upon mankind and civilization than any other person, whether within the Jewish race or without it—is surely qualified for a notice in a magazine devoted to Jewish history, literature, and religion. A book dealing with the teaching of a Jew whose life and character have been regarded by almost all the best and wisest people who have heard or read of his actions and his words as the great religious exemplar for every age, is surely *a priori*, as we might say, worth the attention of Jewish readers. That members of his own race have mainly constituted the exiguous minority which dissent from the judgment of the best and wisest people as to the moral and religious value of his life and teaching, renders it *a priori* again, one would imagine, all the more imperative as well as interesting that they should carefully study the question, read the books, and then, if truth so be, maintain with knowledge and acumen their dissentient position. These reflections force themselves upon me as I begin to notice for the first time a book dealing with the New Testament. It is really explicable enough, but in the light of the foregoing sentences it does seem on the face of it very strange that, so far as I know, no English-born Jewish scholar has proved himself competent to review Mr. Savage's book. I am certainly not yet competent myself, and therefore what follows is rather a number of isolated suggestions than a connected and critical review.

Mr. Savage is apparently a Unitarian minister, and his book (prefaced by some words of recommendation from Professor Toy, the distinguished author of that excellent work *Judaism and Christianity*) is written from a frankly Unitarian point of view. It is really a series of sermons, and capital sermons they are, simple, direct, and to the point. The object is to delineate in broad outline the moral and religious teaching of the historic Jesus, and then briefly to "find out how much of it is vital to-day, and how it bears on the problems, religious and other, with which we must deal" (p. 2). Jesus, to Mr. Savage, "was a man not infallible in his teaching, tempted in all points like as we are, born as we are born" (p. 211), and there was *in kind* nothing more divine about him than there was about Isaiah, and about all men of great moral and spiritual worth. Again, our author is modern in another point. Jesus did not, in his opinion, work miracles. "Frankly, for one, I must tell you that I do not believe that he, or anybody else, ever worked a miracle" (p. 40). But "undoubtedly," and here I should be disposed entirely to agree with Mr. Savage.

Jesus did have, perhaps half in a very large degree, a power which thousands of others possessed before his day and since, a power of personal influence, a power that we call magnetic because we do not know what else to call it, a power of calming those nervously excited or half insane, a power of accomplishing wonderful effects by his touch (p. 40).

Once more, our author, as he is at pains to point out, is concerned with the historic teacher of Nazareth, not with that ideal of humanity which is only more or less connected with and suggested by him—with Jesus, in other words, not with Christ (pp. 15, 16, 207, 208). Hence, Mr. Savage is quite alive to the critical necessity of not supposing that Jesus could not have said this or that because it does not agree with our present religious ideal. The question is not what *we* should like him to have said, but what he actually did say. Moreover, that which he did say must be interpreted and explained, not in the light of the nineteenth century, but in the light of the first. And Mr. Savage, not without reason, points out that this mistaken method of dealing with Jesus and his teaching (omitting what you do not like, and interpreting what you do like in a modern way) is “very common, particularly among liberals” (pp. 13-15, 25).

Now, taking the Gospels as we have them, how are we to find out what Jesus actually said and taught? In his second chapter or sermon Mr. Savage discusses certain canons or rules for this inquiry. For example, he notices the method of the “triple tradition,” warns us to be “careful in accepting as true those parts of the story which are plainly, evidently told under the bias of a preconceived idea” (p. 22), and so on. Among them, however, is one rule, as it seems to me, of doubtful validity. Mr. Savage says:—

There is one other point, one other principle of guidance which is very important; and this will help us, not in the negative, but in the positive way perhaps more than any of the others. If we come across a teaching attributed to Jesus, which is so high, so fine, so spiritual, so peculiar, that we know it was away above and beyond the ordinary level of the thought of his age, we may feel practically certain that that is authentic. It would be perfectly easy for tradition to attribute to Jesus things which were in the popular mind; but the writers would not be likely to attribute to him ideas which were away ahead of the age. (p. 23, cf. p. 36 fin.)

I am not sure whether this rule is invariably true. It is quite likely that the disciples often misinterpreted and materialised the spiritual teaching of their master, but it is also quite possible that they here and there developed and applied it. Especially would this be the case when the teaching of Jesus was expanded and illumined (if also distorted) by its contact with Hellenism. It is strange that Mr. Savage should have taken as an instance of a great saying which we can “feel perfectly sure must have originated with

Jesus," a passage from John. The saying he selects (John iv. 21, 24) is surely Hellenistic, and, noble as it is, improbable in the mouth of Palestinian Jesus. Of one story in John our author is obliged to confess that it is of very doubtful authenticity (p. 171). Take the great utterance of Jesus on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,"—that most noble saying, which seems to put the stamp of religious truth upon the Socratic doctrine that virtue implies knowledge, and vice implies ignorance—it is only found in Luke, and is wanting even there in several manuscripts. We cannot forego the critical tests by which we may estimate the probability of any passage being a true reproduction of what Jesus actually said, even when we have to deal with the highest and finest things.

It may be asked, Was Jesus an original teacher, and on what grounds does his originality depend? Now there is no *à priori* reason why Jesus should not have been original. Jewish authors sometimes write as if there were an antecedent improbability in his having made any big religious or moral step in advance. But why should he not have done so? You can lay down no fixed rules and conditions according to which genius is born. There is no antecedent improbability in a religious genius having been born in Palestine some 1900 years ago. By chance, or destiny, or divine decree, men from time to time are born who, whether in art or morals or religion, sum up in themselves what is best among their contemporaries, and who also advance beyond them. Socrates made such an advance in one sphere, Æschylus in a second, in a third sphere Mohammed, and, as criticism would lead us to suppose, Amos. Why not then, as an *a priori* possibility, Jesus of Nazareth also? ¹

Some Jews seem to think that Jesus is a sort of made-up character, a hero of a novel, who never existed in flesh and blood. Now, apart from the critical unlikelihood and extravagance of such a theory; apart from the fact that the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels is not a consistent character, and is *therefore* not a fictitious one; apart from the fact that the ideal of the reporters would hardly have suggested much which they report, Mr. Savage's words in his second sermon have weight:

Remember one thing, friends: some great power there was eighteen hundred years ago, to change the face of the civilisation of the world. Great results do not come from nothing (p. 36).

A religious teacher might, I suppose, be called original who combined and collected together the best elements of religion

¹ Compare J. H. Crooker, *Jesus Brought Back*, p. 126. (This is another excellent American Unitarian book.)

existing in his time, emphasised those most important and fruitful, developed them, drew out their implications, and rejected or ignored other elements which either did not harmonise with the first, or which, though he and his contemporaries may have been unaware of it, belonged in reality to a lower level and an outgrown age. I am inclined to believe that herein to a great extent lay the originality of Jesus.

Mr. Savage is not quite consistent in his treatment of this subject. In the second sermon he speaks of the "personal fascination of Jesus," and quite justifiably, so far as I can judge. And then he adds :—

There was about him not only the fascination of his personality; there was a charm of speech. I do not say it has never been equalled, but the record of it makes us wonder as to whether it has ever been surpassed. The common people flocked after him, and heard him gladly. The charm of his speech lay in his personal magnetism and power. For you will remember—and you will discover this as I go on in this course of sermons—Jesus taught nothing which was new or original. The Golden Rule was the common property of the civilised world. Jesus did not originate it. The saying that the whole law hung on the two commandments, love to God and love to man, had been stated by Hillel fifty years before. There is hardly a saying of Jesus in the Gospels anywhere which, so far as ethical or spiritual teaching is concerned, was new. The power of Jesus was not, then, in the fact that he uttered startling, sensational, new ideas that the people ran after; it was the charm of his power of expression (p. 39).

I do not think that this is an adequate statement, and it is certainly contradicted by Mr. Savage himself in many other places (*e.g.*, pp. 23, 71, 80 "Jesus did teach a new doctrine of the fatherhood of God," p. 124, etc.), where I should not always be disposed to follow him. But, apart from our author's consistency, it might be asked, What is a *new* doctrine? A doctrine, in the first place, is obviously new which has never been spoken before. In that sense I am not sure that, *e.g.*, Matthew v. 11, 32, 44, 45, xv. 11, 20, are not new. (I do not here argue whether they are also good.) But, in the second place, in the history of a given religion, a doctrine may be regarded as new which emphasises, expands and draws out the implications of some casual saying or term, the full bearing and value of which (its *Tragweite*, as the Germans would say) had not previously been realised and understood. For example, it is possible that the counsel, "Die to live," which "the wise men of the South" are reported to have made to Alexander, comes from a pre-Christian era (it is quoted on the last page of the "Addenda" to my Hibbert Lectures); but, as a new and definite doctrine, it may with propriety, I should imagine, be ascribed to Jesus. In his mouth it was scarcely less

original than the doctrine of "natural selection" in the mouth of Darwin.¹

Before passing to discuss, in separate sermons, "what Jesus taught" about God, man, the kingdom of God, prayer, wealth and poverty, non-resistance, and woman, Mr. Savage attempts to "suggest" "those things wherein resided the secret of his power, the mental, moral, spiritual characteristics of the Man of Nazareth" (page 36). We have already heard of his personal fascination and of his charm of speech. Three other points are noticed which bear more directly upon his religious teaching. "First of all stands out in the life of Jesus the fact, perhaps unequalled anywhere else in the history of the world, of what I can but call the God-consciousness of the man." Here, again (as at present informed, which is, I admit, very inadequately), I am disposed to agree with our author, as also in the explanation of that statement in the sentences which follow:—

His life, his thought, his feeling, was saturated, so to speak, with God. God to him was not any far-off being, in the heavens or in the past, but the Father, ever present, closer to him than his heart-beat. He had only to whisper, and he felt that he was in closest personal communion with God. God in the morning and evening sky, God in the grass, God in the lilies, God in human life about him, God in everything he saw and everything he touched, God everywhere; the horizon, the sky of his life, shining with the unshadowed face of his Father—this was his main inspiration and power. He believed that with God everything was possible, and if this or that did not occur in accordance with his wishes, it was only because his Father had some wiser plan for him. When at last he prayed that, if it were possible, the cup might pass from his lips, he never doubted for an instant, when the cup was pressed with insistent force upon him, that it was because it was his Father's will; and his answer was "Thy will, not mine, be done." This God-consciousness of the man let us place in the forefront of his life (page 37).

The second point is the love of Jesus for mankind. Amid the conflict of the documents (Matthew x. 5, 6; xv. 26, *e.g.*, *versus* Luke x. 33; xvii. 18) it is by no means easy to say how far Jesus was interested in the moral and religious welfare of the Gentile. We may,

¹ A learned friend who has read this review in proof thinks that what I here say is wrong. He says Jesus only once said, "Die to live" (Matt. x. 39, cp. xvi. 25; Luke xvii. 33). "It is only later writers and admirers who pick out casual sayings of this kind and give them prominence. Whereas if it be a Rabbi who said them, he is declared to have only made a passing remark and not formulated a principle. This is not a scientific method." Am I right or is my critic? My own feeling is that self-surrender and self-sacrifice were really principles of Jesus' teaching, by means of which he believed that the highest gain accrues, not only to the community, but in a deep, religious sense to the agent as well.

I think, truly say that Jesus had an enthusiastic love for the poor and the miserable and the outcast, among and for whom he lived and taught; a love, too, for the sinner so long as that sinner was neither proud nor hypocritical; but whether he consciously and deliberately extended his thoughts and care to the nations without Israel, seems rather doubtful. It is, however, probable that what he saw and what interested him in his own people whom he loved, was not their Jewish descent or their Israelite privileges, but their common humanity, and their relationship as men and women to the divine Father. With such limitations we may accept our author's words:—

Next, an enthusiastic love for man—not love for the Jew, not love for his friends, not love for his neighbours, not love for humanity. He taught the Jews, in the face of their prejudices and traditions, that the Samaritan could be the truest neighbour (p. 37) He does not teach that God is the Father of the good only. He is the equal Father of the evil. He makes his sun to rise on the just and on the unjust. He sends his rain on the good and on the bad alike (p. 71).

A third characteristic of Jesus, according to Mr. Savage, "was that he was an extreme idealist" (p. 42). So far as this idealism issued in the famous doctrine of "non-resistance," our author is opposed to it. That doctrine is only explicable and justifiable in view of the fact that Jesus believed that "the second stage in the history of the world" was close at hand (p. 160). In the light of that belief the words of Matthew v. 38-41 "are wise and sane and true." But "they are not good for the kind of world in which we are living to-day." And, moreover, "every step from the beginning of civilisation until to-day has been wrought out by not obeying these particular words in the Sermon on the Mount" (p. 158). On the other hand, the "extreme idealism" of Jesus is manifested in another point to which Mr. Savage alludes in a later sermon.

Not only in the Sermon on the Mount, but everywhere, Jesus teaches the principle of inwardness instead of outwardness; that is, that we are to be judged in the sight of God, not by our outward actions, but by what we are, think, feel, purpose, in our hearts (p. 193).

I remember eleven years ago hearing Professor Steinthal's course of "Religionsphilosophie" at the Jewish seminary at Berlin. His treatment of the rise and development of Christianity struck me as very inadequate and disappointing. But he also held with Mr. Savage that a main principle in the teaching of Jesus was "die reine Innerlichkeit." I believe they are perfectly right, and that Jesus, emphasising an aspect of morality which is of abiding and immense value in a marked and original way, has for this alone well earned his place as one of the great teachers of mankind. It was not new teaching;

but he gave the principle a novel position of importance, and illumined it by his genius. Nevertheless, it is only one aspect of morality, and it may be falsely developed and exaggerated. Mr. Savage says that it is not only a principle of judgment, "but a principle of cheer, uplifting, consolation," and then proceeds to paraphrase the doctrine of Rabbi ben Ezra, Stanzas 7, 23, 24, and 25. He adds :—

We are all of us worse, and we are all of us better, than we appear. Probab'y all of us have wished or longed sometime to do evil things that we have not done; and all of us have longed for great and sweet and high things we have never been able to achieve. And it is by this inward principle of the heart that we are to be judged (p. 194).

All this is surely only true with a considerable dose of limitation and reserve. Angelo's words in "Measure for Measure" admit of a parallel statement for good as well as evil.

'Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus,
Another thing to fall.

And might we not also say :—

'Tis one thing to have longings, Escalus,
Another thing to do.

Now is there any reason why Jews, as such, should not accept these characteristics of Jesus as accurate? Take the first: the "God-consciousness of Jesus." There is nothing supernatural in it, nothing un-Jewish or improbable. "Other Jews possessed it, too, both before Jesus and after him." Undoubtedly. The more the better. But that is no reason why Jesus should not have possessed it, and in an exceptional degree. Take, again, his enthusiastic love for man. Is there anything un-Jewish in that? Why should we not be glad that Jesus was as good as he was? But here we touch on a sore point. Jesus said: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you." Jewish preachers are wont to attack Jesus for these words. First of all, they say, it is not true that it is anywhere said in the Old Testament: Hate thine enemy. The very contrary is true. In Exodus xxiii. 4 we read, "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt verily bring it back to him again" (cp. verse 5). They quote the well-known verses in Proverbs xxiv. 17 (18 is usually omitted), and xxv. 21, 22, and the perhaps less known verse in Job xxxi. 29. Jesus, they argue, with considerable force was, at the least, guilty of a lapse of memory, which suited his purpose and heightened the effect of his argument. Nevertheless, it is surely true that there is in the Old Testament a great deal more

identification between the enemies of Israel and the enemies of God than we should regard as either accurate or commendable, and the utterances of vengeance and hatred often pass the limits of propriety and religion. Will any candid Jew refuse to allow that verses 19 to 22 are a blot upon the noble 139th Psalm? Will he assert that they are exceptional, or that he reads them without a jar? There was, therefore, some good reason for the statement of Jesus, although its form, as we have it, is neither perfectly accurate nor perfectly fair. But, secondly, the Jews say that the command of Jesus is impracticable and monstrous. You can *help* your enemy, but you cannot *love* him. Exodus xxiii. 4 is a good, practical, honest, sensible commandment. Matthew v. 44 is an impossible, useless, insincere commandment. But the mistake is that the Jewish preachers have not appreciated the difference between *ἐχρως* and *ἀγάπη*. Personal affection Jesus did not bid us show our "enemies." But so far as we honestly believe that these "enemies" are in the wrong, or deluded or even sinful, it is possible to pray that their eyes may be opened to their folly, or that they may repent of their sin. It is possible to honestly desire the welfare of a personal foe, who may himself desire our own disadvantage and failure. We can bless those that curse. Above all, it is possible to do the "enemy" a good turn. And this active love it is which (cp. Luke vi. 27-36) Jesus especially meant. I am ashamed to say that I have not read my Graetz for many years, but I seem to remember a striking passage in which the historian speaks of some signal charity shown on the African coast by certain Spanish Jews after the Expulsion, to some shipwrecked Christian Spaniards. Contrasting this conduct with the barbarous horrors of the Inquisition, Graetz says of the Christians, "*So handelten die Bekenner der Religion der Liebe*," and of the Jews, "*So handelten die Bekenner der Religion der Rache*." Of those Jews might it not be said that they "loved their enemies," and fulfilled the mandate of Jesus?

I have already observed that Mr. Savage is at pains to find out what the actual historic Jesus said, not what we might desire him to have said. "We must frame Jesus in the lights and habits of his age, and give him a background of the world that was around him, and judge him in the light of these" (p. 25). "Why," he says in another place, "why should we lose all respect for the great Nazarene if he shared the common beliefs of his age?" (p. 106). It is a great pity that Mr. Savage does not know those habits and beliefs more intimately and at first hand. He is quite impartial enough to profit by a wider knowledge. As it is, he is disposed to accept certain ordinary misconceptions, such as God's "distance" in the age of Jesus, without further

question (pp. 70-203), and he is vague and inaccurate as to the popular eschatology of the time. But even so, Mr. Savage's commendable simplicity and impartiality often make him say something very near the truth. Thus let me quote him about the Pharisees :

The Pharisees, in spite of Jesus' denunciations of them, were probably, on the whole, the better part of the people. They were the great patriotic party, the one which believed in nationalism, the one which tried to save the country and lead it on to a successful future. But they believed that the way to do this was exactly and scrupulously to keep the letter of Moses; and in their scrupulous desire to keep the minutiae of the Mosaic law, they sometimes, as Jesus charged them with doing, forgot that kindness and truth were more important than ritual. The Pharisees, then, were so anxious to keep the Mosaic law, that they [sometimes] forgot deeds of goodness; and it is no wonder—the same has been true in every age, and will be while human nature remains what it is—that some of them took on airs of special sanctity, and so became the types of hypocrisy in every age (p. 54).

Now, I feel sure that Mr. Savage has as accidentally omitted the second bracketed "sometimes" as he has intentionally inserted the first. With that most important and absolutely essential addition, we may all of us, I think, accept the statements here made as accurate; unless, indeed, we desire to go even beyond the Talmud itself, and assert the moral excellence of every Pharisee.

The fourth sermon discusses what Jesus taught about God. While I think that Mr. Savage is entirely wrong as to the conception of God common among the Pharisees (pp. 68-70, 203), he is right in laying stress upon Jesus' habitual use of the term Father for God. It is quite false that the Pharisees' notion of God was that of a "far-removed, awful being, King, Master, Judge, jealous, demanding absolute and exact obedience to the ritual law" (p. 70). No fault of Mr. Savage if he thinks so. He is merely repeating the customary babble of the text-books. The Rabbis spoke of "our Father who is in heaven" as well as Jesus. But it does seem to me as if Jesus fixed upon the most tender and intimate term for God current in his time, used it more habitually and gave it a special *nuance* of beauty and love. "'My Father,' he says, with that sense of the conscious nearness and inter-communion between his soul and the soul of the Infinite One" (p. 71). We may, I fancy, accept that statement as perfectly true. But I wish to point out a very important corollary to this estimate of Jesus' conception of God, which Mr. Savage's admirable fairness and simplicity enable me to do. It is this. The God of Jesus, as we have just heard, was very near to him. "God, to him" (I have quoted the passage before) "was not any far-off being, in the heavens or in the past, but the Father, ever present, closer to him than his heart-beat." Nevertheless Jesus, in our modern sense of the

words, did not believe in the omnipresence of God or in the divine immanence. Let us hear Mr. Savage again: "Heaven, to Jesus, was simply the court of the celestial king, the palace of his Father. God was there and innumerable angels" (p. 56). "Never until the modern world was there the sense of the nearness of God, such as is possible to us to-day. Even to Jesus, his Father was up in heaven. He said: 'I could pray to him if I wanted to, and he would immediately send me more than twelve legions of angels. He hears every whisper, and quick as thought almost he could be at my side.' But he is up in heaven still; there is his throne, that is his home." Moreover, "the Father of Jesus ruled the world like a king, in an arbitrary way, interfered with its working, wrought miracles, needed to bow the heavens and come down to the deliverance of his people" (pp. 78, 79, cp. 123). In other words, the Father of Jesus ruled the world from without and was a transcendent God. Now I do not for a moment wish to urge that these passages are inconsistent with the former passages about the nearness of God to the feeling and thought of Jesus. Quite the contrary. *But those persons who are familiar with what the ordinary text-books say about the outside and transcendental God of Judaism and the Rabbis will understand why I have quoted both series of passages in close conjunction with each other, and I hope that they may be able to draw the desired and, as I think, the inevitable inference.*

Mr. Savage believes that Jesus "teaches—contrary, I think, to common idea—the permanence of the Jewish law." He adds:—

Not a single word in any authentic teaching of Jesus about the law's passing away. On the contrary, he says: "I came, not to destroy the law, but to fulfil. Not one jot, not one tittle of the law shall pass away until all is fulfilled." What is a jot? A jot is the smallest letter of the Hebrew language. What is a tittle? A little stroke—an accent on a letter. You see how forcible the saying of Jesus is: not even the smallest letter of a single word, not even an accent, shall pass away from the law until all be fulfilled. He did disregard the traditions of the people; but there is no trace anywhere of a slighting action or a slighting word concerning what he undoubtedly believed to be the law which originated with Moses" (p. 90).

In spite of such a passage, for example, as Matthew xii. 1-13, I am inclined to believe that Mr. Savage is right; only, if he be so, surely John iv. 21-24, which is accepted on pp. 23 and 33, can hardly be considered authentic.

Mr. Savage points out well that, in regard to such deep questions as the nature and origin of sin, Jesus merely accepted the simple notions current in his day. In fact, what Jesus does teach on the relations of man to God and to the law is, if Mr. Savage be right, wholly Jewish,

the purified quintessence of what is best in the Book of Deuteronomy. Here, again, his originality is shown in emphasising, concentrating, developing that which is best and highest in his predecessors. Let me quote another rather long passage from our author's fifth sermon :—

Jesus taught only one thing as essential in the sight of God. There is no trace in the authentic teaching of Jesus of any mediator, not a trace of any vicarious suffering, not a trace of any vicarious atonement, not a trace of any substituted sin, not a trace of any substituted righteousness ; not one single thing, in any authentic word reported as having fallen from his lips, gives the slightest countenance to any of these supposed central doctrines of the theology of Christendom. He teaches just one thing. He does not teach that man is unable to keep the law : Paul does. No doctrine of inability ever fell from the lips of Jesus. He does not teach that the reason has been implicated in the fall, so that it cannot discern the truth. He assumes the doctrine of man's mental competence to find the truth and discern what is right ; and he assumes man's full power to do it. Not a trace anywhere of Paul's doctrine of a broken will, incompetence, inability to fulfil God's law ; but a grand appeal everywhere to man as a grand, thinking, willing being, able to see and to do that which is right. And then what ? He places this man, competent in brain, competent in will-power—places him, without any sacrifice, any mediation of any kind, any vicarious atonement, any substituted saviour—places him face to face with his Father, his God, and tells him to deal directly with him ; to become reconciled to him ; to see what is right ; to love God with all his heart and with all his mind and with all his soul and with all his strength, and to love his neighbour as himself. And when he is in that condition, he needs nothing else, because this love becomes the spontaneous spring of every good thought, of every good action. This is the teaching of Jesus as to what man needs. Man is a child of God, and needs simply to love God, and live in God and for God ; and that means living in perfectly right relations with his fellow-men. This is the teaching of Jesus as to the nature and needs of man (p. 90).

Is this passage perfectly accurate ? On one point, at least, I am not perfectly sure, for as to mediation, on the absence of which in the teaching of Jesus Mr. Savage insists elsewhere (p. 73), we have the two parallel passages, Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22. But it is certainly in line with the best teaching of the Old Testament : it is in accordance with the best Jewish teaching of to-day.

One notable, and as I should be disposed to say, original feature in the teaching of Jesus with regard to sin Mr. Savage clearly elucidates. It is a feature in which, so far as I have as yet ascertained, he broke away with advantage from the current habits of his day. It is a feature which has had an immense influence upon the development of Christianity in its very best and holiest aspects. Clouded and obscured as the teaching of Jesus soon became by the monstrous overgrowths of dogma and ecclesiasticism, it has yet, all must allow, shone out afresh again and again in this one particular. The sinner and the

outcast, age after age, have owed a debt of gratitude to Jesus. Our rescue societies are traceable to him. He consorted with publicans and sinners and he gave offence, because he seemed, in his gentleness and compassion, to countenance and to condone the very sins which he would cure. But he knew better than those who cavilled the power and the mastery of love. Let me, however, quote Mr. Savage. He is referring to that exquisite story in Luke of "the woman in the city who was a sinner," whose heart had been touched by the preaching of Jesus, and who through him had come to realise the tender love of the heavenly Father. She loved him for what he had made her hear and know, and this love was to be the cause of a better and a purer life. Love regenerates. And Jesus, realising this, declares, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven ; for she has shown much love." I do not precisely know what Jesus meant when he said, "Thy sins are forgiven." Did he not only mean, the new love which has come into your life, the new perception which you have gained of the infinite compassion of God, will enable you to obliterate the past and live more worthily, or did he also mean, God will accept the love and the fruits thereof, and forget what has gone before? You will not only be able to live a new life, but it will be worth your while to live it. Probably both. And, probably, too, any great religious teacher, who realises the goodness of God to a wholly different degree from what we ordinary people realise it, would think himself justified in saying the same. Any way, we may all, so far, agree when Mr. Savage says about this story :—

Here is revealed that spirit of tenderness and compassion which peculiarly characterised Jesus. One of the most noteworthy things about him is that he kept the lightning of his severity for the calculating, the intellectual, the scheming, selfish sins. Everywhere Jesus is represented as the wealth of tender forgiveness for the sins of weakness and passion ; all his severity is for the other kind (p. 170).

Jesus was not all gentleness. He could be stern, he could be severe. It is brought up against him sometimes by captious critics that he showed anger and temper on certain occasions. He could flame out like a flash of lightning against hypocrisy in high places, against pretentious goodness that displayed itself in the streets for the praise of men. But mark one thing : all the sternness, all the severity of Jesus, are directed against these, for the sake of definition, called spiritual sins. He is severe against the hypocrite, against the pretender, against the rich man who treads down the poor, against those who take advantage of the weaknesses of their fellow-men. But this great severity, on the one hand, is offset by an infinite tenderness for the weak, for the tempted, for the poor, for those in any trouble or distress, the unfortunate in no matter what direction. And it is very striking to me—though I cannot go into the discussion of it—that for what we might call the fleshly sins, the sins to which we are naturally tempted, drawn away by the weakness of our own

constitution—for these he has only words of tenderness, compassion, and healing (p. 42).

It seems to me, so far, that Mr. Savage is perfectly right in concluding that Jesus supposed himself to be "The Messiah." He says: "as time went on, I believe that he stood ready at last to assume that he was the appointed one of God who was sent for the deliverance of his people" (p. 108). Mr. Savage, however, does not make it clear whether he believes that Jesus thought that this miraculous deliverance would come before he died, or after his death, at a "second coming." At any rate, however, Mr. Savage's view is that Jesus expected something far more akin to the ordinary Jewish notions of what the Messianic era implied than the mass of Christian critics are disposed to allow. The deliverance was indeed to come "along the line of his thought and teaching," and the condition of membership in the new kingdom was purely moral. "Goodness; nothing else. Love, love in the heart, love in the life, flowing out in service" (p. 113). Nevertheless, "Jesus taught, I think, that he was to be the king, that the kingdom was to come immediately, that it was to be here on this earth" (p. 112). I do not myself believe that Jesus so far spiritualised the idea of the kingdom of God as to make it refer to a purely inward state rather than to an outward as well as inward condition. Luke xvii. 21 seems to me wrongly translated in the usual versions. Can it, in view of the parallels and the context, mean more than that the "kingdom is close at hand?" Meanwhile Jewish critics are usually disposed to animadvert strongly upon the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah. For either, they say, he knew that he was not the Messiah, but pretended that he was, in which case he was a deceiver, or he thought that he was the Messiah, although he was not (for he did nothing which the Messiah has to do), in which case he was self-deceived and self-deluded, and not, therefore, an inspired teacher or an ideal pattern of goodness and religion.

I am not sure whether this second deduction is true. After all, Isaiah and most of the other great prophets were equally wrong as to the Messiah and the Messianic age. All believed in their imminence, and yet none seemed disappointed by the mistakes and errors of his predecessors. It is true that none of them supposed that he was the Messiah himself, but I do not know that this makes the delusion worse, or the teaching less religious. And certainly the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah, however unfounded and however disproved, did not seem to exercise any corrosive or warping influence upon his character. He was not puffed up by vanity or self assertion or conceit. He remained pure and humble and loving to the last.

He conceived himself only as the servant of God. Mr. Savage says :—

I cannot help thinking, then, that Jesus expected along the line of his thought and teaching the deliverance of his people should come; and, if this was the method, why should he not suppose that was the occasion? For, if the God of the universe was the kind of God, ruling the world in an arbitrary fashion, that Jesus believed in, why should he not make bare his arm, and appear for the deliverance of his people? If he could, why should he not renovate the world, and bring about this blessed condition of affairs? It seems to me, taking the point of view of the age, and the simple trust of Jesus in his heavenly Father, that it was the most natural expectation in the world; and I, for the life of me, cannot see how it touches at all the integrity of his thinking, or the grandeur of his intellectual position and power (p. 109).

Substituting in the last sentence "teaching" for "thinking," and "religious" for "intellectual" (cp. p. 183), I should be inclined to agree with Mr. Savage.

There are several other points in our author's book to which I should like to allude, but I have already outrun the limits of a review. But one more quotation before I conclude. It is taken from the eleventh chapter—on the Sermon on the Mount. He says :—

There is a large part of it that we cannot literally accept, that the world never has literally accepted—that men, even while praising it and calling it divine, have not tried to obey. And yet there is, running through it, a spirit, a life, which has given it its hold on the world. And I predict that, as years go by, that hold will not loosen, but will rather become firmer and firmer. In other words, I believe that, while we may be growing from much that has passed as Christianity, while we may be growing away from much that has passed as the teaching of Jesus, when we come at the real essential soul and life of Jesus, we have found that ideal which still leads the world as unapproached and unapproachable as the morning star. I believe that it is the religion of Jesus—not necessarily Christianity—which is to dominate the highest and finest and sweetest life of the future (p. 190).

Not necessarily Christianity. What then? Judaism? May a purified Christianity and a purified Judaism, each, in friendly rivalry, lay claim to Jesus and his religion?

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

November 17th, 1893.